

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
NOV 29 2007

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: **Udayan Rajendra Kanade**

Application No.: **10/667,757**

Group Art Unit: **2109**

Filed: **September 22, 2003**

Examiner: **Michael Wilser**

Attorney Docket No.: **COT003**

Title: **Method and system for allocation of special purpose computing resources in a multiprocessor system**

Honorable Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

AMENDMENT

Sir:

Please enter the following amendment:

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited this date with the US Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed as below, or being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO at 571 273 8300, on the date set forth below.

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dated On November 29, 2007

By 
(Signature)

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
NOV 29 2007

A. Introductory Comments

Based on the amendments and remarks that follow, reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

This amendment is in response to the office action dated May 29, 2007. A request for a three month extension of time for response is also enclosed. When filed, this office action contained 3 independent claims and 18 total claims. After this amendment, this application contains 3 independent claims and 15 total claims. Accordingly, it is believed that no additional claim fee is due. Nevertheless, it is requested that Deposit Account No. 502158 be charged for any fee required for the entry of this amendment.

In the office action, various instances in the specification were objected for informality of language. This has been removed and the instances of informality have been modified, as per the suggestions set forth in the 'Amendments to the Specifications' section.

In the office action, claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over patent to McDonald [US 7,159,216], and the patent to Spoltore et al [US 2004/0015971]. Further, claims 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 USC 112, 6th paragraph for using "mean plus function" language and not meeting the prerequisites of the three-prong test.

In order to more clearly define and distinctly claim the present invention from the prior art, including what is cited herein, claims 1-15 have been amended. In addition, claims 2-4, 6 and 17-18 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 5 and 6-16 have been amended. Further, claims 19-21 have been added, as set forth in the 'Amendments to the Claims' section.